REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 11, 14, 18, 25 and 29 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 13, 16 and 27 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-23, 25, 26, and 28-34 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 11-19 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Number 2004/0042547 to Coleman (hereinafter "Coleman").

Independent claim 11 is amended herewith to include the recitations of prior claim 13. Claim 13 is now canceled.

Coleman discloses a method and apparatus for digitizing and compressing video signals for transmitting the signals between a remotely located computer and a host or local computer

In item 6 on pages 5-6 of the outstanding Office Action, it is alleged that Coleman's FIG. 9 and paragraph [0177] on page 14 of Coleman anticipate the features originally recited in claim 13 (now in amended claim 11). FIG. 9 of Coleman is a detailed flowchart of the decompression algorithm (see e.g., paragraphs [0106] and [0171] of Coleman). The indicated portions of Coleman fail to anticipate or render obvious at least "the image transmitting unit [resuming] transmitting the general image to the information processing apparatus" as recited in amended claim 11. According to paragraph [0177] of Coleman "After the completion of the cache update, the system returns **to the wait for message from server block 801**. This process continues so long as the compression device sends frames of video" (emphasis ours). That is, a transmitting of the general image is not resumed in Coleman, because the system returns to a waiting state. Contrary to the statement in the Office Action, Coleman's paragraph [0177] on page 14 does not disclose or suggest "the cycle resumes with additional frames."

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the "cache update" disclosed in paragraph [0177] of Coleman is not directed to updating the cursor peripheral images. In view of paragraphs [0171] and [0172] of Coleman, there is no evidence that the cache update is directed to the cursor peripheral images that include the image of the cursor on the screen formed by the stream of images transmitted and images located in the periphery of the cursor.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Coleman does not render obvious "**when the cursor location information is acquired from the information processing apparatus,**

the image transmitting unit stops transmitting the general image [...]" (emphasisi added for the missing feature in Coleman).

At least for these reasons, claim 11 and claims 12 and 13 depending from claim 11 patentably distinguish over Coleman.

Independent claim 14 is amended herewith to include the recitations of prior claim 16. Claim 16 is now canceled. Claim 18 is amended to depend from amended claim 14 instead of depending from claim 16 which is now canceled.

In item 8 on pages 6 of the outstanding Office Action, claim 16 is rejected based on similar reasons as claim 13. In view of the above discussion related to amended claim 11 and the features originally recited in claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 14 which includes the features originally recited in claim 16, and claims 15, and 17-23 depending from claim 14 patentably distinguish over Coleman at least due to the following recitation of claim 14:

- transmitting a general image to the information processing apparatus, wherein the transmitting of the general image includes stopping transmitting the general image to the information processing apparatus when the cursor location information is acquired from the information processing apparatus, and resuming transmitting the general image to the information processing apparatus after the cursor peripheral image is transmitted, the cursor peripheral images including an image of a cursor on a screen formed by the stream of images transmitted and images located in a periphery of the cursor.

Independent claim 25 is amended herewith to include the recitations previously of claim 27. Claim 27 is now canceled. Claim 29 is amended to depend from amended claim 25 instead of depending from claim 27 which is now canceled.

In item 13 on page 7 of the outstanding Office Action, claim 27 is rejected based on similar reasons as claim 13. In view of the above discussion related to amended claim 11 and the features originally recited in claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 25 which includes the features originally recited in claim 27, and claims 26 and 28-34 depending from claim 25 patentably distinguish over Coleman at least due to the following recitation of claim 25:

- an image transmitting unit that transmits a general image to the information processing apparatus, wherein, when the cursor location information is acquired from

the information processing apparatus, the image transmitting unit stops transmitting the general image to the information processing apparatus, and, after the cursor peripheral image is transmitted by the cursor image transmitting unit, the image transmitting unit resumes transmitting the general image to the information processing apparatus, the cursor peripheral images including an image of a cursor on a screen formed by the stream of images transmitted and images located in a periphery of the cursor.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

Claims 20-23 and 31-34 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,418 B1 to Schneider ("Schneider"). Schneider does not correct or compensate for the above-identified failures of Coleman to anticipate or render obvious the features of amended independent claims 14 and 25. Therefore, claims 20-23 and 31-34 are patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claims 14 and 25 from which they respectively depend.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 16, 2009   By: _____

Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501